

### **Amendments to the Specification**

Please replace paragraph [0041] with the following marked-up replacement paragraph:

-- Accordingly, a primary goal of an assessment conducted using techniques of the present invention is to provide a recommendation on where to locate which types of labor and in what quantities. A complementary goal is to improve a company's business position by focusing on any gaps or shortfalls that may be present in the value chain at the candidate locations. Location-specific scores are computed to assist in reaching these goals, as will now be described with reference to Figs. 3 - 10. --

Please replace paragraph [0051] with the following marked-up replacement paragraph:

-- By way of example, sample criteria 400 for a hypothetical product are shown in Fig. 4. A set of skills 410 which are deemed to be important for this product are enumerated. As shown in the example, the evaluation of local skills needs to address the following criteria: design/development skills; test (i.e., product debugging) skills; maintenance/support skills; skills in programming languages (and in particular, skills in C, C++, and Java™ programming languages); ability to use several operating systems (and in particular, ~~Windows™~~ Windows®, ~~Linux™~~ Linux®, and AIX® operating systems); and language fluency in English, Chinese, and Japanese. (“Windows” is a registered trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States, other countries, or both; “Linux” is a registered trademark of Linus Torvalds in the United States, other countries, or both; and “AIX” is a registered trademark of International Business Machines Corporation in the United States, other countries, or both.) So, for example, if availability of design/development skills is extremely important to this product, then a value of 5 would be

assigned to this criterion in the product profile, and if a candidate location significantly exceeds the requirements for design/development skills, then that location would be assigned a value of 5 in its geography profile for purposes of the assessment. (Fig. 8 provides sample values for geography profiles of two hypothetical candidate locations.) --

Please replace paragraph [0076] with the following marked-up replacement paragraph:

-- In preferred embodiments, normalized values are computed for each of the sets (i.e., columns) of values in Fig. 10B by summing the values in each set and then dividing that sum by the number of values in the set. The summed and normalized values for the sample data are shown in rows 1080 and 1090, respectively, of Fig. 10B. --

Please replace paragraph [0083] with the following marked-up replacement paragraph:

-- The location-specific scores shown in Fig. 10E (which may be generally referred to as “resource placement scores”) may be analyzed in a number of ways to determine which candidate location should be selected as the optimal location for placement of human resources.

Considering only the opportunity gap score, a large opportunity gap suggests that focus on that candidate location may be a high priority (and this may be true even when a different candidate location seems ~~preferably~~ preferable if considering only the skills gap score). Taking another approach, a low overall skill gap score would be preferable for swiftly completing a development activity (or another activity that may be reflected with alternative choices for local skills 410).

Considering both gap scores together, a high skill gap score combined with a high opportunity gap score would suggest that additional investment in increasing the skills in that location would

benefit the company seeking to place its resources by capturing an increased amount of the unfulfilled opportunity. For the scores shown in rows 1200, 1210, and 1220 of Fig. 10E, a higher value indicates that this candidate location is preferable because of opportunity for improving market share, revenue, and cost considerations, respectively. --